DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 093 JC 900 009

AUTHOR Sheehan, Maria C.
TITLE Faculty and Staff Diversity Update. A Report.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 32p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 2 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Los Angeles, CA, January 18-19, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; *Minority Groups; *School Personnel; State Surveys; Teacher Recruitment; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This quarterly report of the Faculty and Staff Diversity (FSD) Unit of the Chancellors Office of the California Community Colleges presents the 1988-89 objectives of the unit and the actions taken to meet them during the first quarter of the year. The objectives include: (1) the analysis of FSD expenditures by districts during 1988-89; (2) the review of district FSD/affirmative action plans; (3) the provision of technical assistance to districts; (4) the establishment of a nationwide marketing system to attract qualified educators and a statewide registry of applicants; and (5) the development of intersegmental liaisons and links with professional associations and other groups concerned with FSD. A section on the program's budget, indicating that of the $1.4 million budgeted for 1989-80, $1.1 million has been earmarked for local assistance, is followed by sections on program accountability and an awards program to recognize outstanding district achievements. A consultant's report on district progress toward the achievement of affirmative action goals is appended. Based on survey responses from 62 districts, the progress report provides information on FSD expenditures, increases in underrepresented group applicants and hires, colleges targeted for recruitment efforts, districts' self-evaluations of outcomes, ongoing funding requirements, and specific activities that did and did not have expected results. Concluding comments indicate that community college districts have launched widespread advertising and recruitment activities, conducted in-service training to emphasize staff diversity needs, reviewed and revised affirmative action plans, and established networks with minority and women's organizations to seek qualified candidates. The faculty and staff diversity fund assessment questionnaire for 1988-89 is provided. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313093

FACULTY AND STAFF DIVERSITY UPDATE

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
JANUARY 18-19, 1990
1600 WEST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90047

JC900009

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

McIntyre

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
January 18-19, 1990

FACULTY AND STAFF DIVERSITY UPDATE 2

A Report

Background

At its September 1989 meeting, the Board of Governors received the first in a series of regular reports on the work of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit of the Chancellor's Office. A second report was presented to the Board at its November meeting. This agenda item, which constitutes a quarterly report, describes the continuing activities of the unit and the progress made in achieving its stated goals and objectives.

Analysis

The establishment of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit was announced by Chancellor Mertes at the Board's September meeting. The new unit's Vice Chancellor, appointed for a year on an interjurisdictional exchange, had begun her assignment only a week earlier, and her full staff would not be in place until the first week in October. Therefore, her report focused on immediate activities to be completed by the end of September, and on specific objectives to be achieved during the next twelve months.

The report that follows reiterates those ten objectives and describes the action taken by the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit with regard to each of them. (An eleventh objective, added subsequently, is also discussed.) Included is an analysis of expenditures from the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund during 1988-89, and a consultant's study based on an expenditures-assessment survey of Community Colleges.

Staff Presentation: *Maria C. Sheehan, Vice Chancellor*
Faculty and Staff Diversity

Update On The Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit

Program Objectives

Objective 1

Produce an analysis of Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund expenditures by districts during 1988-89, not later than February 1990. The purpose of the analysis is to assess budget and regulation needs.

Action Taken: To assess these needs, the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit developed an expenditures-assessment survey, which was distributed to local districts in October. Sixty-two responded to the survey, which forms the basis for the consultant's study contained in Appendix A. The remaining nine districts have been directed to complete and return the survey questionnaire.

Objective 2

Receive, acknowledge, and approve all revisions to district plans for faculty and staff diversity/affirmative action. Plans will be reviewed and a response provided to districts no later than March 31, 1990.

Action Taken: In a notice mailed on October 10, 1989, districts were reminded that December 31, 1989, was the deadline for submitting revised affirmative action plans, including goals and timetables. Review of the revised plans will be completed by the end of March.

The reminder notice provided districts with the name and telephone number of the technical assistance coordinator. The various types of assistance provided by the coordinator were summarized in the Faculty and Staff Diversity update presented to the Board at its November 1989 meeting.

Objective 3

Provide technical assistance to districts:

- *Establish a resource center of materials designed for novice affirmative action officers (AAOs).*
- *Develop a series of regular communiques for distribution to the field on a quarterly basis, or as needed.*
- *Establish, in cooperation with the Chancellor's Office legal staff, a schedule of workshops to begin in November 1989.*

Action Taken: Thus far, three legal workshops have been presented to the field on recent Supreme Court decisions and guidelines for focusing the use of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund. An institute for novice affirmative action

officers is scheduled in conjunction with the annual Faculty and Staff Diversity Conference, which will be held March 25-27, 1990, in San Diego.

The first issue of the Faculty and Staff Diversity *Communiqué* was mailed to the field in October 1989. An *Update* was mailed in November.

A listing of reference materials for the Resource Center will be completed next month.

Objective 4

Establish (1) an operational definition of "success" in achieving faculty and staff diversity goals, and (2) a formula for funding districts for diversity efforts on the basis of success and need.

Action Taken: An operational definition for the term, "success," has been developed and distributed to the field for review and comment.

A funding formula also has been developed and its underlying rationale has been discussed widely with groups and organizations in the field since October. The formula, which requires revisions to *Title 5* regulations, will be presented to the Board in a separate agenda item scheduled for First Reading at its March meeting. Formal action on the proposed revisions is scheduled for May 1990.

Objective 5

Establish an effective nationwide marketing system that "sells" the California Community Colleges to qualified educators, to begin no later than November 30, 1989.

Action Taken: A marketing strategy was developed with assistance from the San Joaquin Delta Community College District, and in particular, Tim Cox. The marketing campaign began in November 1989 with full-page advertisements in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Black Issues*. A follow-up campaign included additional advertisements in other minority publications, and in news releases. The possibility of using low-cost radio and television advertising, including public service announcements, also is being explored.

A consultant has been retained to complete the nationwide recruiting visits, which will have to be limited due to funding constraints. The visits will be scheduled for January and February.

Objective 6

Implement an effective statewide registry system (automated applicant pool) to assist recruiting efforts, with an interim system effective December 1989, and a permanent system effective July 1, 1990.

Action Taken: The Faculty and Staff Diversity Registry began operation in December, as planned. Because of funding limitations, the primary focus for the next six months will be on the recruitment of faculty and administrators; once it is fully operational, the system will provide job openings and applicant listings for nonprofessional positions as well.

The Registry lists the names, degrees, and job preferences of all those who have expressed an interest in a position with the California Community Colleges. Local districts can access the information via a special code. The Registry also lists job openings at local community colleges on the basis of information provided by districts.

Objective 7

Develop and maintain intersegmental liaisons to augment recruiting efforts and provide assistance to the field.

Action Taken: To promote intersegmental efforts toward diversity, a liaison position, that of intersegmental diversity coordinator, has been established. Staff is seeking to fill the position by January through a temporary six-month interjurisdictional exchange. The budget change proposal submitted by the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit includes this new staff position on a permanent full-time basis.

Objective 8

Identify needed revisions to Title 5 regulations no later than February 1990.

Action Taken: Proposed revisions to *Title 5* regulations governing affirmative action are being developed and will be distributed to the field for review and comment in February. Final revisions will be presented to the Board for its approval no later than July 1990.

Objective 9

Provide a weekly report to the Chancellor.

Action Taken: Weekly progress reports on faculty and staff diversity efforts have been submitted to the Chancellor in the form of brief, verbal updates.

Objective 10

Maintain liaison with the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) Personnel Commission, Community College Consortium on Affirmative Action (CCCAA) Northern and Southern, the Southern 30 Personnel Consortium, the statewide Academic Senate, and other groups concerned with faculty and staff diversity.

Action Taken: Since September 1989, at least one representative of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit has attended every meeting of the Northern and

Southern Affirmative Action Consortiums. Representatives also have attended the majority of meetings of the various statewide personnel consortia and the Fall Session of the Academic Senate, at which they participated in three sessions. A high priority has been placed on participating in these and similar meetings so that staff may provide assistance to districts, as well as maintain a constant awareness of and responsiveness to the concerns and needs of those in the field.

Objective 11

Research methods of encouraging students to pursue careers as community college instructors and provide alternative funding sources to assist students seeking community college careers. (This objective was added in October 1989 by the Chancellor's Task Force on Faculty and Staff Diversity.)

Action Taken: Primary responsibility for this objective will be assigned to the new intersegmental diversity coordinator.

Program Budget

The Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund will be the major source of program support during Fiscal Years 1989-90 and 1990-91, as shown in the Budget Summary. Of the $1.4 million budgeted for 1989-90, $1.1 million has been earmarked for local assistance, with $900,000 of that amount allocated directly to districts on the basis of average daily attendance (ADA). If the budget change proposal submitted for Fiscal Year 1990-91 is approved, the direct allocations will be increased by $3 million. The allocations will be based on a new formula that takes into account district-base and past and current affirmative action performance. Under the new formula, some districts would receive less than in 1989-90 if the requested increase of $3 million for 1990-91 were not approved.

The balance of funds allocated for the current fiscal year, support three professional positions in the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit: one Vice Chancellor and two Coordinators. Support for two additional positions has been provided from the budget of the Planning and Special Projects Unit of the Chancellor's Office.

In addition to the $3.1 million augmentation to the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund, major increases proposed for 1990-91 are $300,000 for national advertising and $107,000 for Consultant and Professional Services/External. These funds will be used to provide additional support for the Registry and the national recruiting campaign.

Budget Summary

Faculty and Staff Diversity Program

1989-90 and 1990-91 Fiscal Years

Item of Expenditure	1989-90 Local Assistance	1990-91 Proposed Increase
Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund: Direct Allocation to Districts	$ 900,000	$ 2,880,000
Faculty and Staff Diversity Registry	100,000	120,000
Faculty and Staff Diversity Grant Program	100,000	
Total Local Assistance	**$ 1,100,000**	**$ 3,000,000**

Item of Expenditure	1989-90 Central Support	1990-91 Proposed Increase
Advertising/Promotion		$ 300,000
Consultant and Professional Services/External		107,000
Total Personnel Services	$ 260,300	82,000
Travel, In-State	16,000	20,000
Printing	1,500	40,000
Data Processing		20,000
Facilities Operations	10,000	8,000
General Expenses	7,500	4,000
Communications	800	10,000
Postage	1,500	10,000
Travel, Out-of-State		10,000
Training	2,400	10,000
Equipment		9,000
Total State Support Budget	**$ 300,000**	**$ 630,000**

Total Budget Change Request Increase
(Local Assistance/Support) **$ 3,630,000**

Program Accountability

Any program that receives funding to accomplish specific tasks should be held directly accountable. The faculty and staff diversity program is no exception. The unit's budget for 1989-90 and the budget change proposal for 1990-91 have been set forth for the Board in some detail.

This section of the report to the Board explains how the faculty and staff diversity program may be held accountable for achieving the purposes set forth in AB 1725.

Section 87102 of the *Education Code* requires that a district (1) periodically affirm in writing that it is acting in compliance with the affirmative action provisions of the *Code*, and (2) be held accountable for the success or failure of its affirmative action plan.

Section 87104 of the *Education Code* has been amended to read that the Board of Governors shall, out of funds appropriated for these purposes: (1) provide assistance to local community colleges in adopting and maintaining affirmative action programs of high quality; (2) report to the Legislature on the number of districts that have adopted and are maintaining affirmative action plans and on the effectiveness of those plans in meeting the intent of this statute; (3) develop and disseminate to community college districts guidelines to assist them in developing and implementing affirmative action employment programs; and (4) establish a technical assistance team to review the affirmative action plan of each college that fails to make measurable progress in meeting the goals and timetables of its adopted plan.

Section 87104 also requires the Board of Governors to establish a major service function to assist local districts in their affirmative action efforts. All of these requirements are quantifiable.

The underlying thrust of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund is to achieve that (1) by 1992-93, thirty percent of all new hires in the California Community Colleges will be ethnic minorities; and (2) by the year 2005, the work force of the California Community Colleges will reflect proportionately the adult population of the state.

By December 1, 1993, the Board of Governors is to assess and report to the Legislature on the extent to which the California Community Colleges have met or have begun to meet these two goals. Any perceived need for a re-assessment of these goals and deadlines also is to be reported so that appropriate revisions can be made on or before September 30, 1994.

Clearly, the Legislature has provided time for progress to be made. The Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit can be held accountable by the Board for meeting the provisions of Section 87102 listed above.

The best way to evaluate the performance of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit is to hold it accountable for achieving its own stated goals and objectives, which were approved by the Chancellor and reviewed with the Board at its September 1989 meeting. The requirement that the Board create a "major service function" dedicated to affirmative action has been met by the establishment of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit. The achievement of systemwide affirmative action goals will require time to assess, since funding specifically designated for that purpose became available less than a year ago.

Recognition Program

Although specific funding for faculty and staff diversity efforts was only approved this fiscal year, many districts have made outstanding efforts and achieved dramatic results with respect to increasing their numbers of underrepresented employees.

To officially recognize these, awards will be given for outstanding achievement in categories such as:

- District that has hired the largest number/percentage of ethnic minorities effective fall 1989.
- Superintendent/president/chancellor who has been most supportive of faculty and staff diversity.
- District board of trustees or individual trustee most involved in fostering faculty and staff diversity efforts.
- Faculty member most productive in achieving faculty and staff diversity.
- "Innovator of the Year" for the affirmative action or personnel officer responsible for the most innovative program in the preceding fiscal year.
- "Lifetime Achievement" for an affirmative action or personnel officer who has made major contributions to staff diversity during his or her career.

Nominations for these awards will be solicited from representative groups, including chief executive officers, the California Community College Trustees, the statewide Academic Senate, and others.

With approval by the Board of Governors, time will be set aside at the March 1990 meeting for a brief ceremony to formally recognize the award recipients. The recipients will also be honored during a ceremony at the Annual Faculty and Staff Diversity Conference on March 25-27, and will be featured in the April issue of the Faculty and Staff Diversity *Communiqué*.

APPENDIX

Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund

Assessment Report

Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund
Assessment Report

Introduction

When Assembly Bill 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988) was signed into law on September 19, 1988, certain areas of the reforms embodied in the legislation became effective January 1, 1989. One of those major reform areas to become effective in January 1989 was Affirmative Action/Staff Diversity.

In the intent language accompanying AB 1725, the Legislature recognized that California is undergoing a major demographic, social, and economic transformation, and that community colleges are at the center of this change. The economic and social future of California will be determined in large part by the manner in which its educational institutions are able to prepare a large and increasingly diverse population to participate successfully in the future.

The community colleges' continuing role in educating California's diverse population has been strengthened through passage of AB 1725. The legislation clarifies the unique mission of the Community Colleges in providing transfer and vocational education and identifies a central leadership role for the colleges in matching the diversity of their student bodies with a comparable diversity among faculty and staff.

To initiate staff diversity reform, $ 1 million was appropriated for the last half of the 1988-89 fiscal year. This Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund, administered by the Board of Governors, was created to pursue two goals for the California Community Colleges: (1) by 2005, the cumulative work force of the colleges should proportionally reflect the adult population of the state; and (2) by 1992-93, 30 percent of all new hires in the system should be from underrepresented groups (ethnic minorities, the disabled, and women).

In February 1989, the Chancellor's Office distributed $900,000 from the Fund to the colleges. The money was distributed on the basis of 1987-88 funded average daily attendance (ADA) with no district to receive less than $1,000. It was allocated specifically for the purposes of:

1. Extending outreach to and recruitment of faculty and staff from underrepresented groups;

2. Providing incentives to hire members of underrepresented groups;

3. Providing in-service training and other staff diversity programs;

4. Supporting the costs of reporting, publishing, disseminating, and reporting affirmative action success rates; and,

5. Supporting the costs of preparing and updating affirmative action plans.

To ensure that the colleges were progressing toward the achievement of their affirmative action goals, AB 1725 amended the language of *Education Code* Section 87104 to include a ". . . report to the Legislature regarding the number of districts which have adopted and are maintaining affirmative action programs, including the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the intent of this article. . . ."

To determine the colleges' progress, a Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund questionnaire was developed during July and August 1989 in consultation with college personnel and affirmative action officers. The questionnaire was field tested in September and subsequently released to all districts in October.

The remainder of this report summarizes the districts' responses to the questionnaire.

Purpose of the Assessment

In addition to addressing the requirement to provide a report to the Legislature, the Chancellor's Office determined, through consultation, that the assessment should also provide an opportunity for the districts to share information regarding the use of their Faculty and Staff Diversity funds, the successes they experienced, and other information that potentially could be of advantage to the system as a whole.

The questionnaire, displayed in Appendix A, was therefore designed to determine:

1. The expenditure of Faculty and Staff Diversity funds for:

   a. extended outreach and recruitment
   b. incentives to hire
   c. in-service training and other related activities
   d. reporting, publishing, and disseminating success rates
   e. preparing and updating affirmative action plans

2. The amount and percentage of funds carried over into 1989-90, and the reasons for the carryover.

3. The nature of the districts' expenditure plans.

4. The establishment/involvement of functional advisory committees.

5. The ongoing funding requirements/expectations for 1989-90.

6. The matching expenditures and the sources of funds used for the match.

7. The unique uses of the funds that could benefit other districts.

8. Which districts did and did not achieve their expected results.

9. General comments districts would be interested in sharing with other districts.

A draft questionnaire was field tested in September in nine districts of varying size and complexity throughout the state. Subsequently, the questionnaire was modified slightly and released statewide in October.

Analysis and Implications

A. District Responses

As of this date, sixty-two districts (8 percent) had responded to the questionnaire. The nonrespondents were located primarily in the Bay Area and, as a consequence, were still dealing with the aftereffects of the earthquake. Rather than delay the report until those districts could respond, the Faculty and Staff Diversity Unit decided that the information collected was sufficiently representative of the system as a whole to adequately complete the report.

B. District Allocations

In February 1989, the Chancellor's Office distributed $900,000 of the $1 million allocation to the colleges. The money was distributed on the basis of 1987-88 funded ADA, with no district to receive less than $1,000. District allocations, grouped in increments of $5,000 are displayed.

Allocation Distribution

Amount of Allocation	Number of Districts Receiving
$ 1,000 – $ 5,000	15
5,001 – 10,000	22
10,001 – 15,000	13
15,001 – 20,000	11
20,001 – 25,000	2
25,001 – 30,000	1
30,001 – 35,000	3
35,000 +	4

Four districts received the minimum allocation of $1,000. The largest single district allocation was $69,553. The average allocation per district was $12,676; the median allocation was $8,988. Although the $900,000 provided needed financial assistance to the colleges in initiating their staff diversity plans, it is obvious that when distributed among the 71 districts, the allocations to individual districts were minimal. This becomes particularly apparent when considering that districts may spend as much as $1,000 to advertise a single position in minority and other publications.

C. *Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund Expenditures*

Twenty-two of the districts, representing 35 percent of the respondents, reported they had fully expended their Faculty and Staff Diversity funds as of June 30, 1989. The remaining forty districts reported that they had carried over all or a portion of their allocations into the 1989-90 fiscal year. The predominant reason for the carryover was attributed to insufficient time for districts to organize advisory committees and adequately prepare and implement their staff diversity plans. In certain instances, the vacancy of personnel and/or affirmative action officers prevented full expenditure; in others, conscious decisions were made to carry over a portion of funds to augment 1989-90 allocations in order to more effectively implement districts' plans.

Forty-one of the districts, representing 66 percent of the respondents, reported they had spent other district resources to augment their staff diversity allocation. Those that were able to track their matching expenditures reported over $605,000 in other district resources for that purpose.

Nature of Expenditures

As could be expected with a goal that 30 percent of all new hires come from underrepresented groups by 1992-93, and with the faculty hiring mandates of AB 1725, the predominant expenditure of Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund allocations was for extended outreach and recruitment of underrepresented groups.

Fifty-two of the districts, representing nearly 84 percent of the respondents, reported they had spent nearly $300,000 of their allocations for increased advertising in minority publications, participation in job fairs targeted at underrepresented groups, compilation and preparation of recruitment materials, and recruitment trips to colleges throughout the nation with predominantly ethnic minority enrollments.

Five of the districts, representing about 8 percent of the respondents, reported spending in excess of $40,000 for incentives to hire members of under-

represented groups. The majority of these expenditures were to pay for the applicant's interview expenses.

Twenty of the districts, representing 32 percent of the respondents, reported spending more than $14,000 for in-service training. Most of these expenditures were directed toward attendance at workshops on affirmative action guidelines and in- service training of district faculty and staff regarding local affirmative action objectives and candidate selection procedures.

Five of the districts, representing about 8 percent of the respondents, reported spending over $4,000 for reporting, publishing, and distributing affirmative action success rates. Included in these costs were campuswide meetings to review affirmative action policies and procedures.

Eleven of the districts, representing 18 percent of the respondents, reported spending nearly $22,000 for preparing and updating their affirmative action plans. The expenditures ranged from attendance at workshops and conferences on how to write an affirmative action plan to employing coordinators and consultants to advise on and prepare the plan.

Finally, thirteen districts, representing 20 percent of the respondents, reported expenditures in excess of $27,000 for other purposes associated with their staff diversity efforts. Included within this group of expenditures was a diverse set of activities ranging from increased release time for coordinators' participation in affirmative action activities to the development and implementation of internship programs with local universities to encourage minority students' pursuit of community college teaching careers.

Clearly, the $397,029 in Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund expenditures during 1988-89 by respondent districts were consistent with the purposes for which the Fund was established. Further, the allocations permitted the districts to initiate rigorous pursuit of the major affirmative action goals of AB 1725. Although only the expenditures of this specific Fund are discussed above, the reader is reminded that districts spent over $605,000 in matching resources to augment these and other affirmative action efforts.

Clarity of Expenditure Categories

Although fifty districts indicated that the expenditure categories for use of the funds were sufficiently self-defined so that they were comfortable in their expenditure, twelve districts requested additional clarification. The predominant concern related to the districts' desire for a legal definition and examples of allowable hiring incentives. Concern was also expressed regarding the propriety of providing student scholarships and the purchasing of equipment and computer hardware/software that would be related directly to district staff diversity efforts.

D. Nature of Expenditure Plan

Thirty-one districts, representing 50 percent of the respondents, reported they had developed a formal expenditure plan for the use of these funds. Twenty-five districts indicated they had established and/or involved an advisory committee in the development of their expenditure plans. Establishing expenditure plans collegially was not mandated for these funds. The large number of districts choosing to use this method indicates the spirit of AB 1725 is being observed.

E. Increase in Underrepresented Group Applicants and Hires

Thirty-four districts, representing 55 percent of the respondents, reported they had definitely experienced an increase in the diversity of their applicant pools. Sixteen districts reported they either did not experience a measurable change in the diversity of their applicant pools or had used the allocation for purposes other than hiring, such as preparation and update of their affirmative action plans. The remaining districts reported they had not completed the hiring process and therefore they were unable to respond.

Thirty-one districts also reported they had experienced an increase in the diversity of their hires. As with the applicant pool inquiry, 20 districts reported they either did not experience a change in the diversity of their hires or had spent the allocation for other purposes. The remaining districts reported that it was too early to accurately respond to the inquiry.

When asked to comment on changes in applicant pools and hires, districts provided a variety of responses. Most frequently, districts reported they experienced both an increase in ethnic minority and women applicants and hires. Those districts that quantified their responses indicated success rates characterized by the following sample of comments:

- "resulted in employment of 12 underrepresented candidates out of 32 positions filled (37.5% minority hires)"
- "campuswide effort increased hiring from 0 to 18 percent in ethnic diversity"
- "diversity for applicant pools increased 16 percent for full-time faculty and 50 percent for part-time faculty"
- "16.67 percent minority hires for new faculty in 1988; 57.14 percent in 1989"
- "3 out of 6 faculty positions were filled with ethnic minorities"

- "district hired 30 percent minorities for faculty positions"
- "of 130 faculty positions, district achieved hiring rate of 48.5 percent minority and 55 percent women"

A number of districts commented they were still analyzing the data or expected to realize the result of last year's efforts during their recruitment and hiring cycles this year. Overall, the comments clearly demonstrate that the focus on staff diversity statewide has and is resulting in a significant change in both the diversity of applicant pools and district hires.

F. *Colleges and Universities Targeted for Recruitment*

Districts reported having targeted a number of colleges and universities throughout the nation for recruitment of underrepresented group applicants. As could be expected, University of California and California State University campuses were reported most often. A number of districts also concentrated their recruitment efforts in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and toward institutions with predominantly minority enrollment in the East and Southeast.

G. *Districts Evaluation of Outcomes Resulting from Expenditures*

Thirty-nine districts, representing 63 percent of the respondents, reported successful outcomes from their expenditure of their Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund allocations. Twelve districts indicated that their results were evaluated as not being successful while 11 districts reported they had not had sufficient time to evaluate the results.

When asked to comment on the reasons for evaluating the outcomes as successful or not, a variety of responses were provided. The most obvious response was the increased hiring of ethnic minorities and women. However, other significantly important comments were made. For example, the Fund provided the opportunity for many districts to advertise position vacancies more extensively, particularly in minority publications; implement professional recruitment programs; and to participate in job fairs, thus increasing their visibility and enhancing their hiring opportunities in the future. Others reported that the renewed emphasis on diversity resulting from funding improved the awareness and sensitivity of their faculty and staff in selecting underrepresented group applicants to fill current and future positions. Perhaps as important, some districts were able to employ affirmative action officers and develop networks with professional ethnic minority organizations.

H. *Ongoing Funding Requirements and Expectations*

Districts reported that their expectations for 1989-90 would be directed primarily to the continuation and expansion of their advertisement and recruit-

ment efforts. Many had plans to prepare recruitment materials, attend local and statewide job fairs, and expand their advertising program. A number of districts indicated the need to hire affirmative action staff and facilitators and provide release time for faculty recruiters.

Some districts are in the process of implementing teaching-intern programs and providing in-service training to increase the participation and commitment of their employees to staff diversity. Preparation and dissemination of affirmative action plans were also noted as high priorities because of the requirement that the plans be updated and submitted to the Chancellor's Office by December 31, 1989.

In terms of funding, the districts' general theme was that allocations were insufficient to meet the requirements and goals of AB 1725 and that the districts will require more money in the future to support their ongoing programs and commitments. As will be seen in the next section, AB 1725 program improvement funds and Proposition 98 allocation for 1988-89 are being used during 1989-90 to partially mitigate the funding shortfall. Beyond 1989-90, however, these resources may not be available to sustain ongoing program costs.

I. *Use of AB 1725 Program Improvement and Proposition 98 One-Time Allocations to Augment Staff Diversity Funding*

Thirty-eight districts, representing over 60 percent of the respondents, indicated they were utilizing AB 1725 program improvement funds to augment their staff diversity program during 1989-90. Because AB 1725 program improvement plans were being developed at the same time the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund assessment was being conducted, not all districts were able to report the amount of program improvement monies that were being used for staff diversity. However, to give the reader a sense of the commitment of the districts to staff diversity, 22 of the 38 districts using program improvement funds reported budgeting a total in excess of $640,000 to augment their staff diversity effort.

Fourteen districts, representing about 20 percent of the respondents, indicated they were utilizing Proposition 98 one-time funds to support staff diversity. Nine of the 14 districts had budgeted in excess of $240,000 of the funds for staff diversity. The remaining five districts were unable to report specific allocations. Collectively, between those two funding sources, districts reported spending over $880,000 to supplement their Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund allocations for 1989-90.

J. *Activities that Did and Did Not Achieve Expected Results*

DID

Districts reported a variety of staff diversity activities and efforts during 1988-89 that achieved the expected results. Included among the comments provided were such things as:

- intern program with local colleges
- national advertising and targeted advertising in minority publications
- reactivating vacant personnel/affirmative action officer positions
- creation and distribution of recruitment materials and brochures
- developing networks with minority and women's organizations
- in-service training to enhance district employees' appreciation of staff diversity needs
- participation in local, state, and national affirmative action conferences
- participation in job fairs
- payment of applicants' interview expenses
- revising,updating, and publishing staff diversity/affirmative action plans
- individual contact and one-to-one recruiting

DID NOT

Other districts impressions and experiences with some of the above activities, as well as others, were reported as not having produced the expected results. Included among the comments provided were such things as:

- too little time and too little money
- advertising in certain minority publications
- sending recruitment teams to remote markets too costly for the limited number of applicants responding
- in-service training has yet to overcome potential biases
- funds made available too late in the year to maximize their use
- State affirmative action mailing lists did not produce enough applicants
- some applicants withdrew due to noncompetitive salaries and high housing costs
- massive out-of-state mailings of job announcements

Depending on a district's particular situation and approach, it would appear that the same activities could be perceived as either successful or unsuccessful. It is possible that some of the activities that districts reported as unsuccessful in 1988-89 will provide a favorable outcome in the future.

Perhaps the most important outcome of these activities, whether successful or not, was the heightened awareness both within the state and nationally that California Community Colleges are aggressively pursuing affirmative action objectives and seeking underrepresented groups of applicants for vacant and newly created positions.

K. Unique Uses of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund and Other Information

Twenty-three districts, representing 37 percent of reporting districts, provided descriptions of unique ways they had used their allocation and other information to share with the readers of this report.

Recommendations

An analysis of district responses to the assessment has lead to the following list of recommendations for consideration by the Chancellor's Office.

1. The most important single recommendation is to secure additional funding to support the districts' staff diversity programs. The staff diversity goals of AB 1725, coupled with the faculty hiring mandates, simply cannot be addressed adequately through a $1 million allocation. Further, sufficient funds should be provided in any increased allocation to allow the Chancellor's Office the opportunity to provide effective assistance to the districts in the successful implementation and operation of their staff diversity activities.

2. A new allocation mechanism should be developed that would provide small districts a larger allocation and recognize other characteristics of districts' programs and success.

3. The Chancellor's Office should re-evaluate its March 1989 plan, *Toward a New Diversity*, with an emphasis on determining how it can best assist the districts.

4. As a result of the high cost of advertising and recruiting, the Chancellor's Office should assist districts in locating and expanding the pool of qualified groups from applicants underrepresented.

5. The Legal Affairs Division of the Chancellor's Office should provide the districts with a legal definition and/or guidelines, including examples of allowable hiring incentives and other uses of the fund that require classification.

6. The assessment, either in its current format or as revised through consultation, should be conducted again in the fall of 1990 to evaluate the results of districts' continuing faculty and staff diversity efforts.

Conclusion

District responses indicate that within the last several months much has occurred in pursuit of AB 1725's staff diversity goals. Districts have launched widespread advertising and recruitment activities to increase the diversity of their applicant pools and hires. In-service training has been conducted or is underway to emphasize staff diversity needs and to overcome existing biases. Affirmative action plans are being reviewed, revised, and published. Districts have developed networks with minority and women's organizations to seek qualified candidates and have implemented cooperative programs with high schools and universities to encourage students from underrepresented groups to pursue community college teaching careers.

The awareness of these efforts both statewide and nationally has been heightened and the expectation levels and enthusiasm of those participating in these endeavors reflect optimism and commitment.

APPENDIX A

Survey Instruments

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

FACULTY AND STAFF DIVERSITY FUND
ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1988-89

District: _____ **Phone**: (____) _____

Respondent: _____ **Title**: _____

1. Did the district fully expend its 1988-89 Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund allocation? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

2. If you responded **No** to question 1, what amount and percent of the total allocation was carried over into 1989-90? **$** _____ **%** _____

   What were the reasons for the carry-over of funds?

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Did the district expend other (matching) resources to enhance the staff diversity fund? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

   If **Yes**, what amount? **$** _____

4. Please describe the expenditure of your staff diversity allocation as it related to the following purposes:

   a. Extended outreach and recruitment of underrepresented groups:

      Amount **$** _____

      Nature of Expenditure

      _____

      _____

      _____

b. If incentives to hire members of underrepresented groups were utilized please indicate below.

Amount: $ _____

Nature of Expenditure

_____

_____

_____

c. In-service Training:

Amount: $ _____

Nature of Expenditure

_____

_____

_____

d. Publishing, distributing and reporting affirmative action success rates:

Amount: $ _____

Nature of Expenditure

_____

_____

_____

e. Preparing and updating affirmative action plans:

Amount: $ _____

Nature of Expenditure

_____

_____

_____

f. Other (*describe*) _____

Amount: $ _____

Nature of Expenditure

_____

_____

_____

5. In your opinion, were the categories referenced in 4a-f sufficiently self-defined so that you were comfortable in utilizing staff diversity funds?
Yes ☐ **No** ☐

If **No**, in which areas do you need more specific guidance and how?

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Did the district develop a formal expenditure plan for the use of this allocation? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

7. If you responded Yes to question 5, did the district establish or involve an advisory committee in planning the expenditure of this allocation?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

8. As a result of the district's staff diversity fund expenditure, did you realize an:

a. Increase in the number of underrepresented group applicants?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

b. Increase in the number of underrepresented group hires?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐

9. Please briefly describe the changes if any in the diversity of the district's applicant pools and hires as a result of these expenditures.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Which colleges and universities have been targeted by the district for recruitment of underrepresented applicants?

College: _____ Location: _____
College: _____ Location: _____
College: _____ Location: _____
College: _____ Location: _____
College: _____ Location: _____
College: _____ Location: _____

11. Do you evaluate the outcomes resulting from the expenditure of these funds to have been successful? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

12. Please briefly describe why you evaluate the outcomes as successful or not.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

13. What ongoing funding requirements and expectations does the district have for continuing these efforts in 1989-90?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. During 1989-90, is the district directing any of its AB 1725 program improvement allocation ($70 million) and/or one-time augmentation ($45 million) allocation to continuing the staff diversity effort?

AB 1725 **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ Amount: $_____
One-Time **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ Amount: $_____

15. Please briefly describe those efforts during 1988-89 that **Did** and **Did Not** achieve the expected results.

Did: _____

_____

_____

_____

Did Not: _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Please list any unique uses of the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund and/or other information that would be worthy of sharing with other districts.

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. The following data may be used to develop the Faculty and Staff Diversity Funding Formula. Please be as accurate as possible.

EEO6 Job Categories	1988-89		1989-90 *(To Date)*	
	Net Positions Hired*	Ethnic Minorities Hired	Net Positions Hired*	Ethnic Minorities Hired
1. Administrative				
2. Faculty**				
3. Professional & Non Faculty				
4. Clerical				
5. Technical & Paraprofessional				
6. Skilled Crafts				
7. Service Maintenance				
Totals				

* "Net Positions" means unduplicated positions. For example, if the President's Secretary retired at the beginning of 1988-89 and the replacement resigned, giving way to a second replacement, that is one "Net Position," not two. The ethnicity of the second replacement would be used for the "Ethnic Minorities Hired" column.

** Tenured, tenure-track, full-time categorically funded, and tenured on leave of absence.

APPENDIX B

Summary of Data Response

Summary of Data Response

Table 1
(Questions 1 and 2)

Distribution of Allocation Expenditures Among 62 Reporting Districts by Proportion Expended

District No.	Spent	Allocation	$ Spent	Carryover	% Spent
22	all	$ 183,531	$ 183.531	$ 0	100.0
33	some	542,259	213,498	331,761	39.4
7	none	80,247		80,247	0.0
	Total	**$ 809,037**	**$ 397,029**	**$ 412,008**	**49.1**

Table 2
(Question 3)

Expenditure of Other Funds for Diversity Purposes

Extended Other Funds	District No.	Spent	Mean Amount
Yes – amount known	35	$ 606,375	$ 17,325
Yes – amount unknown	6		
No	11		
Total	**62**	**$ 606,375**	**$ 17,325**

Table 3
(Question 4)

Amount of Faculty and Staff Diversity Funds Spent for Various Purposes

Purpose	District No.	Mean Amount	Amount
Outreach and recruitment	52	$ 279,919	$ 5,729
Incentives to hire	5	41,529	8,306
In-service training	20	14,805	7,403
Reporting AA plans	5	4,103	821
Udated plans	11	21,513	1,956
Other plans	13	31,916	2,455
Unaccounted		3,244	
Total		$ 397,029	

Table 4
(Questions 5-8, 11, 14)

Distribution of Response to Various Questions Requiring A "yes-no" Response

Question	Response		No Response
	Yes	No	
5. Categories sufficiently defined?	50	12	
6. Formal expenditure plan?	31	31	
7. Use advisory committee?	25	7	30
8. (a) Increase underrepresented applicants?	34	16	12
(b) Increase underrepresented hires?	31	20	11
11. Fund expenditure successful?	39	12	11
14. (a) Expending AB 1725 money for diversity?	38*	21	3
(b) Expending one-time augmentation money?	16**	41	5

Table 5
(Question 9)

Distribution of College and University Locations Used for Extended Outreach

State or Region	District No.
Arizona	8
California	24
District of Columbia	6
Flordia	2
Georgia	5
Louisiana	3
Maryland	2
Michigan	1
Mississippi	2
New Mexico	8
New York	2
North Carolina	1
Oklahoma	2
Texas	10
Virginia	1
East	1
Midwest	1
Southeast	2
Southwest	3
United States	4